

REMARKS

The office action of July 21, 2010, has been carefully considered.

It is noted that claim 28 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over the patent to Brackenridge in view of the patent to Boswell et al. and the patent to Forster et al.

Applicant has amended claim 30.

It is respectfully submitted that the claims presently on file differ essentially and in an unobvious, highly advantageous manner from the compositions and methods disclosed in the references.

Turning now to the references and particularly to the patent to Brackenridge, it can be seen that this patent discloses the bromination of partially fluorinated aromatic compounds with 6-12 moles of bromine per mole of aromatic compound (see Brackenridge, col. 2, line 44 to col. 3, line 54). However, the selection of moles of bromine was made in view of the use of the brominated compounds as flame-retarding additives, flame resistant electric

conductor insulation additives, heat transfer media, and lubricants wherein high thermal stability and/or flame resistance are advantageous (see col. 7, lines 6-13).

Contrary to this, the selection of the new compounds of the presently claimed invention was made in view of their use in the analysis of halogenated compounds. Since this application has nothing to do with the application in Brackenridge, the selection of 6 to 12 moles of bromine per mole of aromatic compound cannot make obvious the new compounds of the presently claimed invention. Moreover, the new compounds of the present invention constitute valuable new alternatives for the analytical chemistry of halogenated organic compounds and, therefore, enrich the relevant technological field. Thus, applicant submits that Brackenridge does not teach or render obvious the presently claimed invention.

Neither of the secondary references to Boswell and Forster provide any teachings that are combinable with Brackenridge so as to arrive at the compounds of the claims presently on file because the references remain mute about the use of the compounds they disclose relative to the analytical chemistry of halogenated organic compounds.

In view of these considerations it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claim 28 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over a combination of the above-discussed references is overcome and should be withdrawn.


Reconsideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested.

Any additional fees or charges required at this time in connection with this application may be charged to Patent and Trademark Office Deposit Account No. 02-2275.

Respectfully submitted,

LUCAS & MERCANTI LLP

By


Klaus P. Stoffel
Reg. No. 31,668
475 Park Avenue South
New York, New York 10016
(212) 661-8000

Dated: November 22, 2010

CERTIFICATE OF EFS-WEB TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted by EFS-web to the Commissioner for Patents on November 22, 2010.

By:


Klaus P. Stoffel

Date: November 22, 2010